

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1-14 have been pending.

Claims 1-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-3, 6 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Julia Kelly, *Using Microsoft Excell 2000*, ISBN: 0789718626, hereinafter referred to as "Kelly," in view of Eick et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,596,703, hereinafter referred to as "Eick."

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kelly, in view of Eick, in further view of Jou et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0071814, hereinafter referred to as "Jou."

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kelly, in view of Eick, in further view of Misue et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,764,239, hereinafter referred to as "Misue."

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kelly, in view of Eick, in further view of Segawa et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0032037, hereinafter referred to as "Segawa."

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims are amended and claim 14 is cancelled without prejudice, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

The Examiner's rejections are traversed.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION:

The Office Action at page 2, item 1, objects to the specification for failing to capitalize "MICROSOFT EXCEL." In accordance with the foregoing, the specification is amended taking into consideration the Examiner's comments. Withdrawal of the specification objection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 101 REJECTIONS:

Claims 1-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-11 and 13 are amended taking into consideration the Examiner's comments. Withdrawal of the rejection to the claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS:

Independent claims 1, 12 and 13 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Kelly in view of Eick.

The Office Action at page 4, lines 8-11, alleges that Kelly, at page 422, section "add Your Own Labels" discloses the claimed "displaying an image indicative of the arranged keyword at the display position set on the radar chart" as recited, for example, in claim 1. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiners assertion. Kelly discusses, at page 422, "to add a free-floating label anywhere on the chart: Select the chart area; then type your label text ... and press enter. **The Label will display somewhere in the chart**; you can format it and move it wherever you want." In other words, Kelly's "label" is placed "somewhere in the chart," and, thus, Kelly fails to disclose or suggest the claimed "**setting a display position** for the arranged keyword at a location nearer to a reference point for an axial label the degree of association of which with the arranged keyword is relatively high than to a reference point for an axial label the degree of association of which with the arranged keyword is relatively low; and **displaying an image** indicative of the arranged keyword **at the display position set** on the radar chart" as recited in claim 1, because Kelly only discusses label placed "somewhere in the chart."

The Office Action at item 3 alleges that Kelly discusses the claimed "**judging a degree of association between each of a plurality of axial labels and at least one arranged keyword** on the basis of data indicative of the relationship between each of the plurality of axial labels and the arranged keyword." The Office Action, at page 4, lines 5-7, alleges "EXCEL allows setting a display position for the arranged keyword anywhere on the radar chart." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiners allegation. Kelly discusses "Select the chart area; **then type your label text** ... and press enter" in "Add Your Own Labels" (p. 422). In other words, the label is text entered after the chart is created. Claim 1, recites in part "**judging a degree of association between each of a plurality of axial labels and at least one arranged keyword** on the basis of data indicative of the relationship between each of the

plurality of axial labels and the arranged keyword,” and therefore, in one claimed embodiment, “an arranged keyword” should be determined before the claimed “judging a degree of association between each of a plurality of axial labels and at least one arranged keyword.” Therefore, “label” in accordance with Kelly which is entered after chart creation cannot be identified as being equivalent to the claimed “arranged keyword,” and, thus, Kelly fails to disclose or suggest the claimed **“judging a degree of association between each of a plurality of axial labels and at least one arranged keyword on the basis of data indicative of the relationship between each of the plurality of axial labels and the arranged keyword”** as recited, for example, in claim 1. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be based upon Kelly and Eick, because there is no rational, articulation or reasoned basis that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine or modify the relevant teachings of the references, since Kelly fails to disclose, or suggest to one skilled in the art, the claimed **“judging a degree of association between each of a plurality of axial labels and at least one arranged keyword...”** and **“setting a display position for the arranged keyword...”**

Independent claims 12 and 13 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for similar reasons as independent claim 1.

Dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependence from the independent claims.

For example, Claim 6 discloses **“remaking a radar chart on which the axial labels have been replaced with the arranged keywords and on which the arranged keywords have been replaced with the axial labels** by the use of original tabular data for the radar chart being displayed in response to operation input provided while the radar chart is being displayed.” The Office Action, at page 6 lines 6-18, alleges that Kelly discusses the features of claim 6. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiners allegation. Kelly shows a button to “change orientation” (p. 394). However, even if the button can change “axial labels”, it cannot change “arranged keyword” because, as discussed above, the Examiner asserts Kelly “labels” (p. 422), which are text entered by a user and is not associated with cells in a table, are equivalent to the claimed “arranged keywords.” However, as discussed above, the “labels” are not equivalent to the claimed “arranged keywords” because the “labels” are entered after the chart is created.

Withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims, and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 12, 2006

By: _____



Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501